



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/543,310	04/05/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS990913US1	6408

45502 7590 12/13/2005

DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY.,
SUITE 2110
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

MIRZA, ADNAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/543,310

Applicant(s)

DUTTA, RABINDRANATH

Examiner

Adnan M. Mirza

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-15,17-23,25-31,33-39 and 41-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-15,17-23,25-31,33-39 and 41-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention According to claim 1 language as to “in response to the request from the second data processing system, sending a reduced-content page, corresponding to the first data page, from the first data processing system to the second data processing system” comparing it with Fig. 2. The language of claim 1 doesn’t follow through the Fig. 2.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "wherein the second data processing system communicates with the first data processing system over a more expensive connection than the third processing system communicates with the first data processing system " in which the word expensive is vague . There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-23, 25-31, 33-39, 41-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard et al (U.S. 6,430,624 and further in view of Rennard et al (U.S. 6,615,131).

As per claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33, 41 Jamtgaard disclosed a method for delivering data over a network system, comprising the steps of: receiving, in a first data processing system, a request for a first data page from a first client system; in response to the request from the second data processing system, sending a reduced-content page, corresponding to the first data page, from the first data processing system to the second data processing system (col. 2, lines 40-59); and in response to the request from the second data processing system, sending the first data page from the first data processing system to a third data processing system used by a user of the second data processing system but separate and distinct from the second data processing system (col. 4, lines 8-19).

Art Unit: 2145

However Jamtgaard failed to disclose wherein the second data processing system communicates with the data processing system over a more expensive connection than the third data processing system communicates with the first data processing system.

In the same field of endeavor Rennard disclosed wireless device communicates through a wireless carrier, gateway and the Internet with server. In one embodiment, one or more of these connections need not be sustained continuously. FIG 9 depicts a method for reducing the time when a connection between the wireless carrier and the server is sustained through the Internet. Among other reasons, this approach proves beneficial in reducing the connection time through the Internet. Such a method also proves beneficial when there exists a lag or latency in the Internet connection or where the Internet connection has a high associated cost measured in money, time or other cost factor (col. 17, lines 51-63).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the sending the first data page to a second client system, wherein the first client system communicates with the data processing system over a more expensive connection than the second client system communicates with the data processing system as taught by Rennard in the method of Jamtgaard to reduce the cost of the wireless connection to Internet and reduce latency in terms of down link.

Art Unit: 2145

6. As per claims 2-3,10-11,18-19,26-27,34-35,42-43 Jamtgaard disclosed after the receiving step, the step of creating a reduced-content page corresponding to the first data page (col. 8, lines 12-24).

7. As per claims 4,12,20,28,36,44 Jamtgaard disclosed wherein the second data processing system communicates via a wireless connection (col. 4, lines 58-67).

8. As per claims 5,13,21,29,37,45 Jamtgaard disclosed wherein the reduced content page is a wireless markup language page (col. 6, lines 59-63).

9. As per claims 6,14,22,30,38,46 Jamtgaard disclosed wherein the first data page is a hypertext markup language page (col. 4, lines 59-66).

10. As per claims 7,15,23,31,39,47 Rennard disclosed wherein the first data page is sent to the third data processing system via an electronic mail message (col. 9, lines 52-57).

11. Claims 8,16,24,32,40,48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard et al (U.S. 6,430,624), Rennard et al(U.S. 6,615,131) and further in view of Puri et al (U.S. 6,148,330).

As per claims 8,16,24,32,40,48 Jamtgaard-Rennard failed to disclose wherein the first data page is sent to the third data processing system via a push delivery system. In the sane field of endeavor Puri disclosed window has displayed content that was automatically generated and push-delivered to personal computer by a channel service/content provider via the Internet and WWW according to the present invention (col. 10, lines 56-64).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the wherein the first data page is sent to the second client system via a

Art Unit: 2145

push delivery system as taught by Puri in the method of Jamtgaard-Rennard to make the conventional web-browsing technology more efficient.

12. As per claims 49,50,51 has the same limitations as to claim 1 therefore under the same reasoning claims 49,50,51 can be rejected.

Applicant arguments are as follows:

13. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose “sending a reduced-content page corresponding to the first page, from the first data processing system to the first data processing system” and further “sending the first data page from the first data processing system to a second data processing system”.

As to applicant’s argument Jamtgaard disclosed the system and method permits content to be input into the system in a variety of different formatting languages. In addition, the system permits the formatted content to be output in any mark-up language and protocol, such as WML, HTML, HDML, XML, etc. Advantageously, each display page on the device may be customized. To organize the content for display on the devices according to the input/output format, such as the display screen size parameters of the devices (col. 2, lines 48-59). According to one skill in the art at the time of the invention easily interrupted the reformatting according to the display screen size parameters of the devices as reduce content page.

14. Applicant argued that prior art failed to disclose a request for information and sending the information to both the requesting computer and a second designated computer used by the user of the requesting computer.

As to applicant's argument Jamtgaard disclosed "that translation server may take information directly from an Internet content provider's web site in various forms such as HTML data, XML data, or raw data feeds and then re-deliver it, via the translation server and through a telecommunication system and through a telecommunication system, such as wireless carrier base station that uses a typical communications formats such as CDPD, to information appliances in a format that is completely customized to the end user's device type and browsing capabilities (col. 4, lines 58-67).

15. Applicant argued that prior art failed to disclose a broadcast capability of "sending" a full page to one computer and a reduced-page to another computer, where the computers are related by user, and further in response to "receiving" a request from one of the computers.

As to applicant's argument Jamtgaard disclosed the system and method permits content to be input into the system in a variety of different formatting languages. In addition, the system permits the formatted content to be output in any mark-up language and protocol, such as WML, HTML, HDML, XML, etc. Advantageously, each display page on the device may be customized. To organize the content for display on the devices according to the input/output

Art Unit: 2145

format, such as the display screen size parameters of the devices (col. 2, lines 48-59). According to one skill in the art at the time of the invention easily interrupted the reformatting according to the display screen size parameters of the devices as reduce content page. Also Jamtgaard disclosed that content format to be output in different mark up language such as HTML, WML, XML. One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention knows that HTML has different format size as compared to WML that requires to be on the reduced format of the content.

There are two other references namely Leppinen (U.S. 6,735,186) and Zarom (U.S. 6,356,529) are also related to Applicant's application.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (571)-272-3885.


17. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)-272-3933. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866)-217-9197 (toll-free).

Adnan Mirza

Examiner



JASON CARDONE
SPB AU2145